

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,569	07/27/2001		Barry L. Caren	MGDN 0150 PUS	9257
22045	7590	08/04/2004		EXAMINER	
BROOKS			SHIMIZU, MATSUICHIRO		
	1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR				PAPER NUMBER
SOUTHFIE	SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075			2635	
				DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/916,569	CAREN, BARRY L.					
nancery near.	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Matsuichiro Shimizu	2635					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
THE REPLY FILED on 4/14/2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.					
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment					
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	$ \mathcal{N}$					
10. Other:		KAN					
		BRIAN ZIMMERMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicant's argument (lines 16-19, page 2), the examiner maintains that Rangan teaches prohibiting operation of the remotely controlled component during at least one programmable period (col 4, lines 7-16, user is prohibited from use of the buttons 130,135,140 to perform secured operation when authentication wait time 250 or period is not expired). Furthermore, the argument is based on applicant's specification wherein programmable in the contex of a transmitter that may be programmed after the transmitter is initially programmed is not written in the claim 1. Rregarding applicant's argument (line 20, page 2 to line 16, page 4), the examiner maintains that prior arts of Boyles and Rangan are combinable in view of common arts associated with vehicle security system to teach subject matters claimed in claim 1.